

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Applicant's claims 1-12 are currently pending in the above-identified patent application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002005827 (hereinafter "Kawasaki"). The Examiner also identified a typographical error in claim 1, which the Applicant has corrected in this Amendment.

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant has amended claim 1, as reflected under the heading Listing of Claims beginning on page 2 of this paper, in order to comply with Examiner's suggested changes. Applicant has also prepared a response, respectively traversing the Examiner's rejections and amending Fig. 12.

Applicant's Reply to the Rejection of the Claims

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kawasaki. Applicant submits the following remarks wherein the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claimed invention is a portable terminal. More particularly, Applicant's claimed invention is a portable terminal that provides a first housing having a display unit and a second housing having a primary input unit, wherein the first housing and the second housing are connected together at a common joint. The first and second housings are permitted to rotate about the common joint of their connection, permitting a user to switch the portable terminal's mode of operation from an open state to a closed state and vice versa.

Regardless of the mode of operation, the display unit of the first housing is continuously viewable by the user. This is reflected in independent claims 1 and 9 in the requirement that "said display unit is visible to a user in a closed state and an open state." However, portable terminal functions (e.g., e-mail, camera, web, etc.) provided on the selection screen displayed on the display unit of the first housing are altered when the portable terminal's mode of operation is switched. Allowing the arrangement of portable terminal functions on the selection screen to be dependent upon the mode of operation allows the user to use an alternate input means (an auxiliary input unit as recited in claims 1 and 9) of accessing and executing in

the closed state the same mobile terminal functions that would be available to the user in the open state.

In the portable terminal's open state mode of operation, the primary input unit on the second housing of the portable terminal is exposed and may be used in conjunction with the portable terminal functions provided on the selection screen displayed on the display unit of the first housing. For instance, this mode of operation may utilize a selection screen that arranges portable terminal functions multi-dimensionally. This multi-dimensional arrangement is easily accessible using the primary input unit on the second housing of the portable terminal.

In the portable terminal's closed state mode of operation, an auxiliary input unit is made available along the side surfaces of the first housing and the second housing for operation in conjunction with the portable terminal functions provided on the selection screen displayed on the display unit of the first housing. The auxiliary input unit serves as an alternate means of accessing and executing portable terminal functions when the portable terminal is in its closed state and the primary input unit is no longer accessible to the user. When the portable terminal is in its closed state, portable terminal functions are arranged on the selection screen in a manner that permits them to be navigable using the auxiliary input unit. For instance, this mode of operation may utilize a selection screen that arranges portable terminal functions one-dimensionally.

Independent Claims 1 & 9

In rejecting Applicant's independent claims 1 and 9, the Examiner asserts that all of the elements of these claims are shown in Kawasaki. *Office Action, Pages 3 and 6*. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawasaki fails to show or suggest the use of a single display unit which displays different selection screens that are made dependent upon the mode of operation of a mobile terminal, which are suitable for continuous operation by different accessible means of input.

The Examiner specifically refers to figures 2a-2b, and paragraphs 21-23 to show that Kawasaki teaches the aforementioned limitations of Applicant's claimed invention. Yet, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the limitations of Applicant's claimed invention are not shown. Kawasaki describes a mobile terminal in which two separate and distinct displays are provided: (1) an auxiliary display 22 located on the rear portion of the lid case 2 and (2) a main display 21 located on an inner surface of the lid case 2. Kawasaki fails to disclose or even suggest Applicant's use of a single display unit that is continuously viewable by the user whether

the mobile terminal is an open or a closed state. Furthermore, Kawasaki fails to disclose first and second selection screens that are under the independent control of an auxiliary input unit and main input unit, respectively. Specifically, Kawasaki fails to disclose that the "display unit is adapted to display a first selection screen which is appropriate for an operation by said auxiliary input unit when both of said housings are in said closed state, and adapted to display a second selection screen which is appropriate for an operation by said main input unit when both of said housings are in said opened state."

Moreover, none of the drawings in Kawasaki teach the aforementioned selection screen limitations of Applicant's claimed invention. Every drawing figure provided in Kawasaki is clearly described in conjunction with two displays, an auxiliary display located on the rear portion of the lid case and a main display located on an inner surface of the lid case. Not a single drawing figure in Kawasaki depicts a mobile terminal with one display visible in both its closed state and its open state as provided in Applicant's claimed invention. Since Kawasaki fails to describe this limitation of applicant's invention, it can not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention as defined by independent claim 1, claims 2 through 8 which depend therefrom, and independent claim 9, claims 10 through 12 which depend therefrom, are patentable over the cited references.


For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that this patent application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP
919 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212-756-2000

Dated: May 1, 2006
New York, New York

By:


John Garces
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,616